Pages 1 - 20

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY, MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC. CONSUMER PRIVACY USER PROFILE LITIGATION.

NO. 18-MD-2843 VC (JSC) San Francisco, California Friday, June 19, 2020

TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs:

BLEICHMAR FONTI & AULD LLP

555 12th Street

Suite 1600

Oakland, California 94607

BY: LESLEY E. WEAVER, ESQ.

ANNE K. DAVIS, ESQ.

MATTHEW MONTGOMERY, ESQ.

KELLER RORHBACK, LLP 1201 Third Avenue

Suite 3200

Seattle, Washington 98101

BY: DEREK W. LOESER, ESQ.

DAVID J. KO, ESQ.

CARI C. LAUFENBERG, ESQ.

For Defendants:

GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

200 Park Avenue

New York, New York 10166

BY: ORIN SNYDER, ESQ.

Reported By: BELLE BALL, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR

Official Reporter, U.S. District Court

(Appearances continued, next page)

```
So you can start, deal with that part first.
 1
          And either your position will be the same as it is in
 2
    Massachusetts, or it will be different.
 3
          And then the next question is: What, if anything, is
 4
 5
     there in addition to what was asked for?
          So is there anything in addition to what was asked for in
 6
    Massachusetts?
 7
               MS. STEIN: Yes, so it was --
 8
 9
               THE COURT: No, no, I guess -- I'm asking the
      plaintiffs.
10
               MS. STEIN: Okay.
11
               MR. KO: Your Honor, this is David Ko. I can speak
12
      to that.
13
          I want to make sure -- the Massachusetts issues are, of
14
15
     course, relevant. But our requests with respect to the
16
     documents related to the app developer investigation conducted
17
    by Facebook are much broader than that. Right?
18
          It's --
19
               THE COURT: Okay, right.
20
                        It's documents related to what they've done
21
      in the wake of Cambridge Analytica from 2018 to present,
      ongoing. You know, all documents related to that.
22
23
               THE COURT: Right. Okay, that's -- right.
      trying to break it in two, because I'm figuring with respect
24
25
      to the request as to the Massachusetts documents, it seems to
```

me there's -- there's no problem with saying by next Thursday, 1 Facebook needs to say what is their position with respect to 2 Is -- our position presumably it's going to be the same 3 as it is in the Massachusetts case. 4 But maybe not. So they should have to nail that down by 5 next Thursday. 6 Now, with respect to the additional docs, is this on your 7 agenda for your meeting on the 22nd? 8 Like, next week, are you -- are you discussing this? 9 So, on the 22nd, we were discussing, you 10 MS. DAVIS: 11 know, those requests that are outstanding where the threshold position of Facebook is that, you know, documents will not be 12 produced, or they are outside the scope of the case. 13 I think it would be a great idea to add this to our agenda 14 15 for that discussion. THE COURT: Yeah. Why don't we do that. All right. 16 So I won't give you, necessarily, that deadline of the 17 18 Thursday, but just include it within there, because it sounds like you started talking. 19 But at least with respect to where the request overlaps 20 with what was requested in Massachusetts, by Thursday, you 21 should have your decision finalized. 22 MS. CLARK: Your Honor, if I may for a second. 23 I do want to be clear that the request plaintiffs have 24

done us is quite different from the request that we received

25

So it's not as simple as: Turn over everything we turned 1 2 over to Massachusetts. THE COURT: No, no, no, no; I'm sorry. 3 Ι misunderstood. 4 5 I guess all I'm saying is if there were documents that you weren't objecting to turn over, turn over. That's all. 6 Not 7 that you have to waive your arguments. But what it sounds to me like is that you are pretty far 8 along, and that you have the position. That's fine. They're 9 not arguing right now that your position is right or wrong. 10 11 MR. SNYDER: Right. THE COURT: They just want you to take your position. 12 So it seems to me as a goal we should have for next 13 Thursday on the ADI, the investigation, take your -- take your 14 15 position. 16 I'm confident, because you actually have been working 17 really well and don't want to bring disputes to me that you 18 don't have to, that come Thursday, if it looks like there's a 19 path that the dispute can be narrowed, the parties will 20 continue along that path, and try to narrow it. 21 But -- so I'm going to give you that goal of next Thursday 22 Just take your position. Whatever it is. on these ADI. 23 MR. SNYDER: Yes, Your Honor. I have no view on it, whatsoever. 24 THE COURT: Either

25

way.